

## **The Progressive Non-Economic and Economic Nationalist-Internationalist Manifesto**

A modern communist manifesto designed to help people quickly and clearly recognize which communist parties are anti-revisionist or revisionist. Reading theory in depth is important, but communism needs to always seek to maintain an updated communist manifesto or else the barrier to entry will continue to become higher, slower, and more unclear due to the concepts being spread out across an ever-growing number of books, which leads to revisionism increasing.

### **Categories**

There are two categories of policies: progressive and regressive. There are two sub-categories of policies: non-economic and economic. There are two sub-sub-categories of economic policies: non-exploitative and exploitative. Not all policies have both progressive and regressive categories, some only have one. Though the base term is often assumed to be progressive.

In the long term, economic policies determine non-economic policies, so the two aren't separate during this time, because progressive or regressive economic policies eventually force society to adopt progressive or regressive non-economic policies, respectively. In the short (and/or medium) term, this isn't the case, so the two are basically separate during this time; and although non-economic policies can't be completely solved without economic policies being completely solved, completely solving economic policies is a long process, even during communism, so people can't be expected to put their non-economic policies on hold; therefore non-economic policies can still be struggled for separately in any economic system for limited improvements.

Especially nations' and women's progressive non-economic policies, which also shouldn't be grouped together out of respect for their independent histories. If regressive non-economic and/or economic oppressors are advocating for progressive non-economic policies, then the preferred position generally is to criticize them for being regressive oppressors, while still supporting the progressive non-economic policies they're advocating for. Though this decision can vary non-internally (externally) and internally for the masses of people and communists in imperialist and imperialized capitalist countries.

There are two categories of oppression: non-economic and economic. There are two sub-categories of economic oppression: non-exploitative and exploitative.

There are two relational categories of nationalism and internationalism: non-economic and economic.

Progressive non-economic nationalism and internationalism = single-nation countries, with an alliance.

Progressive economic nationalism and internationalism = communism, domestic and global.

### **Progressive Economic Nationalism and Internationalism (Communism)**

There are three categories of economic systems: communism (building communism), capitalism, and feudalism; so economically, one can only be a communist, money-capitalist, or feudalist, respectively. Hybrid models such as semi-capitalist/feudalist countries exist today, as do semi-communist/capitalist countries. But unless proven otherwise, semi-communist/capitalist countries are revisionist communist countries that are building capitalism instead of communism.

The most progressive economic nationalism and internationalism is communism because each economic system is more economic nationalist and internationalist than the next, and also because only communism can solve the economic contradictions that capitalism poses for nations. Communism for progressive economic nationalists is a means to an end to do what's best for the nation, not an end in itself.

Anti-communism is semi-communism/capitalism (revisionist communism), capitalism, or feudalism. Anti-capitalism is communism or feudalism. Anti-communism during capitalism is no different than anti-capitalism during feudalism. Money-capitalists (and revisionist communists and capitalist sympathizers) are resisting the economic revolution just as feudalists did. They all also often try to obfuscate their actual economic system by naming it something else in order to push their fraudulent agenda. But what matters is the economic system that's being built (within reason) and/or the economic system's content, not the name.

The transformation (a more specific and complete term than abolition, sublation, assimilation, etc.) of capital from private property into capitalist property under capitalism has been completed due to the rise of open/public (unrestricted market to public) and/or closed/"private" (restricted market to public) equity, bond, alternative, etc. investing. Capital (value in process) has grown too large and interconnected to be privately owned or managed, so capital is now capitalist property (property of capitalism), and the old private capitalists are now money-capitalists who are mere owners of substantial money. Money-capitalists can be in any sector (and/or sub-sector) (open/public, closed/"private," unnationalized, nationalized, government, etc.) and they can be sector managers themselves or they can delegate these roles to non-money-capitalists.

This has reduced private property under capitalism to petty/small private property which consists of products (houses, toothbrushes, hardware, software, etc.) produced by the means of production (though subscriptionization is increasingly transforming products into capitalist property too), small businesses, small and/or unproductive land, etc. that under communism nobody will be allowed to own. Because they'll become communist property that can be confiscated, reallocated, etc. at any time to better serve society, whether in easy or difficult times. The term "privatization" should be thought of as capitalization (of which under capitalism there are two categories: unnationalized and nationalized), petty privatization, etc.

There are two categories of imperialism: non-economic and economic. There are two sub-categories of economic imperialism: capitalist and feudalism. Imperialism's capitalist definition is major net economic exploitation primarily through monopolistic unequal exchange.

There are six sub-sub-categories of economic imperialism, which can be calculated through various methods: major net economic exploiter imperialist, intermediate net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized, minor net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized, minor net economic exploited semi-imperialist/imperialized, intermediate net economic exploited semi-imperialist/imperialized, and major net economic exploited imperialized. Regardless of capitalism and semi-capitalism status, the major net economic exploiter countries are imperialist capitalism, while the rest are imperialized capitalism. And the latter can be semi-communism/capitalism (revisionist communism) or semi-capitalism/feudalism.

There are three categories of money-capitalists and capitals: imperialist, semi-imperialist/imperialized, and imperialized. Semi-imperialist/imperialized and imperialized money-capitalists and capitals can only be temporary anti-imperialists and progressive economic nationalists due to their for profit nature, so only communists can be permanent.

There are three sub-categories of money-capitalists and capitals: non-monopoly, semi-monopoly (domestic and/or regional, but not global), and monopoly (global). Monopoly money-capitalists and capitals are mostly in imperialist capitalist countries, but they can also be in semi-imperialist/imperialized capitalist countries as a minority. Imperialist, monopoly money-capitalists and capitals can also be in any sector, and not only in the finance sector, as is often mistaken, because all sectors engage in investing (and financialization).

There are three primary classes waging class struggle: money-capitalist, labor aristocrat, and proletariat. The money-capitalists were defined earlier. The labor aristocrats are the mental and/or physical unproductive or productive city or rural countryside workers who are major net economic exploiters and have more to lose than just their chains. The proletarians are only the mental and physical or physical productive workers at the point of production in any job, regardless of its sector, that's sufficiently industrialized (industry and industrialization are machine production) who are intermediate or minor net economic exploiter and minor, intermediate, or major net economically exploited for their surplus value under capitalism and have nothing to lose but their chains.

There are three categories of imperialist capitalist countries: non-labor aristocratic, semi-labor aristocratic, and labor aristocratic. Different calculation methods need to be performed to measure if the value is going to the money-capitalists and/or the workers, which are discussed further in the next section.

Communism is a universal fact. It occurs independently among different species across different galaxies. So as long as communists adopt proven policies and/or prove their new policies are possible, no specific sub-ideology is required. And not having a specific sub-ideology is a more efficient way to combat revisionism, ideological orthodoxism, dogmatism, sectarianism, rejection of correct contemporary communist theory (particularly economic theory), intentional incorrect theory interpretations from those not interested in armed revolution, etc. and maintain a communist party, that before the revolution, constantly splits parties one into two with those that hold the incorrect positions when a party can't be reconstituted. Because if it's between a small correct communist party vs. a large incorrect/revisionist one, only the small one is communist.

There are various relational non-economic categories of communism: theory, politics, military, etc. But it's primarily an economic category policy that empowers the proletariat and the masses of people to expropriate the money-capitalists, transform the economic relations of production from for profit to for need, transform capitalist, feudalism, and petty private property into communist property, and transform all classes into one post-class entity. Under capitalism, the means of production are part of capitalist property that need to be transformed into communist property, which basically means that the workers need to own them through nationalization and enact for need economic relations of production.

Communist-armed revolution is progressive violent defense while capitalist-armed counter-revolution is regressive violent offense. Ever since the first communist revolution, one can no longer become a communist pre-initial communist revolution until they're in an anti-revisionist communist party that's engaged in armed revolution. Before then they're anti-revisionist communist/comrade sympathizers, and pretend communists/comrades if they think otherwise since an unarmed, initial communist revolution hasn't proven to be possible.

Communist-sympathizer parties not engaged in armed revolution do not represent communism regardless of what their stated intentions are. Revisionist communist parties engaged in armed revolution also do not represent communism as they will eventually be overthrown by anti-revisionist communists if they ever achieve state power. Though certain conditions apply as to which ways these parties are revisionist, because the initial communist revolution isn't just an academic, box checking affair.

Dictatorship of the proletariat, an overall, centrally planned economy, regardless of minor centralization level differences, and a progressive communist building state, until it withers away, are all required. All forms of state governments are class dictatorships, of which there are three: communism (proletariat class), capitalism (money-capitalist class), and feudalism (aristocrat class). And "corruption" is merely anti-communism and/or capitalism in action.

All classes aren't transformed into a post-class entity under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The mental and/or physical unproductive or productive city or rural countryside workers remain different classes. This transformation can only occur when the economic forces of production develop/revolutionize enough under a communist for need production system (capitalism's for profit production system would block this transformation because capitalism can't exist without classes, so automation alone won't end capitalism) to allow all classes, including the proletariat, to transform themselves into one post-class entity, which would end the need for a progressive communist building state (that was transformed from the regressive capitalist state under capitalism and will become superfluous and wither away post-transformation) and progressive economic oppression.

Communism will then advance from an intra-class to a post-class society. But building communism will still continue post-class and post-state, because the ultimate definition of communism is transforming the present state of things.

Non-economic superstructure primarily refers to politics, culture, ideas, institutions, state, etc. Economic relations of production now primarily refer to producing for need vs. for profit. Economic forces of production primarily refer to the means of production (instruments such as technology, tools, factories, etc.), subjects (materials, raw materials, etc.), and labor-power. Economic views primarily refer to communism, capitalism, or feudalism.

The non-economic superstructure (relational), economic relations of productions, and economic views have various categories, which may (split by the word "and" if they are) or may not be in combination with each other: imperialist, semi-imperialist/imperialized, imperialized and single-nation, multi-nation and host, non-violent settler, violent settler and communism, semi-communism/capitalism (revisionist communism), capitalism, semi-capitalism/feudalism.

In the long term, the masses of people's (the revolutionary subject the proletariat included) economic views are primarily determined by the economic forces of production. Historical materialism/economism and practice have proved that eventually the economic forces of production develop enough to come in contradiction with their present economic relations of production (human labor and exchange-value decreasing, machine labor and use-value (productivity) increasing) and force economic views to transform, thus intensifying class struggle.

In the short term, since communism and capitalism can exist simultaneously when the economic forces of production are nearly identical, the masses of people's economic views are primarily determined by the non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production as a group, which may or may not be in contradiction with their class interests. Though it's also not impossible for other factors to determine their economic views in the short term as well. But

despite any contradictions and other factors, dialectical materialism (relations to economism) and practice have also proved that the economic forces of production threshold to start building communism for humans has already been met since we now have the knowledge and the means to develop them that we didn't have during early feudalism.

For reference, there's no contradiction between the economic system and the primary worker classes during communism and imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism since the economic systems are in the interests of the proletariat and labor aristocracy, respectively. There's a contradiction between the economic systems and the primary worker classes during imperialist, non-labor-aristocratic and imperialized capitalism though since neither economic system is in the interest of the proletariat. During capitalism, communists can't control the non-economic superstructure and the subsequent economic relations of production, so they try to, mainly but not only, use class to win the masses of people over to communism since the workers are economically exploited. And when they can't use class due to the legal workers in a country being labor aristocrats, they can try to use other factors, which are discussed further in the next section.

And though the non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production primarily determine the masses of people's economic views in the short term. For individuals, the economic forces of production, the economic relations of production, and class interests can be primary, which is why communists arose during capitalism even when there was no formal communist thought in society. And also unfortunately why revisionist communists, who wanted to become money-capitalists, arose during communism. And both have the power to transform the masses of people's economic views by transforming the non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production.

During capitalism, revolutionary situations emerge through various main ways, such as when the workers are intermediate or minor net economic exploiter and minor, intermediate, or major net economically exploited — and lack of revolution when they aren't, when a capitalist crisis occurs, when the economic system can no longer develop the economic forces of production, when a world or regional war breaks out, when a civil war breaks out, when an internal or external contradiction flares up, etc.

The initial communist revolution is then produced by a communist party engaged in armed revolution and the proletariat class. Although other working classes can produce it too.

During communism, counter-revolutionary situations emerge mainly because a lack of a continuous cultural revolution from the beginning of building communism led to the emergence of revisionist communists (an antagonist class) in society who took over communist parties and began building capitalism by transforming the non-economic superstructure to revisionist

communism (usually the first step of building capitalism), transforming the subsequent economic relations of production to for profit, transforming communist property into capitalist property, petty private property, etc., creating new money-capitalists, etc.

So a continuous cultural revolution is needed from the beginning of building communism to place the non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production above the economic forces of production when it comes to the order of importance in building communism and to educate the communist party and the masses of people on how to progressive non-economic and economic, non-exploitative oppress revisionist communists and capitalist thought in society, until society no longer creates revisionist communists in the first place, which are also progressive oppressions because repressing revisionist communists and capitalism is progressive. And like capitalism, communism and continuous cultural revolution will require multiple attempts to succeed even if they fail at first, because they're still correct. Communists should never give up, because that's what anti-communists want.

Revisionist communists place the economic forces of production above the economic relations of production. They basically claim that as long as the non-economic superstructure is placed above both, then it's still a dictatorship of the proletariat, even though the proletariat's class interests are clearly being subordinated. But by keeping the economic relations of production for profit, it makes their non-economic superstructure semi-communism/capitalism (revisionist communism and ultimately anti-communism) anyway. They're content in letting things such as money-capitalists, capitalist property, petty private property, unemployment, social murder, etc. exist as long as the party allowing them claims it's building communism.

The reason revisionist communists do this is because they think they need to wait until the economic forces of production develop enough before the economic relations of production can be transformed from for profit to for need (before the money-capitalists can be expropriated, before capitalist, feudal, and petty private property can be transformed into communist property, etc.), which are all revisionist capitalist reforms.

And they don't specifically state the time length the economic forces of production will take to develop enough because they don't want to open themselves up to more scrutiny. The only specific time length they could probably give is waiting until the economic forces of production develop enough to transform all classes into one post-class entity, meaning waiting until the proletariat doesn't exist as a class anymore. But regardless, any reason is incorrect because there's no valid reason to believe that communism needs non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms to develop the economic forces of production.

To summarize specifically on the initial communist revolution and counter-revolution. In the long term, the economic forces of production are primary in transforming the masses of people's

economic views, while the non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production are secondary as a group. In the short term, the latter two as a group can be primary, which again may or may not be in contradiction with their class interests.

Communists have produced revolution during imperialized capitalism when there's been a contradiction between the latter two and the proletariat class. Revisionist communists have produced counter-revolution during communism when there's been no contradiction between the latter two and the proletariat class. So despite the fact that the labor aristocracy isn't the revolutionary proletariat, theoretically communists should be able to produce revolution during imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism when there's no contradiction between the latter two as a group and the labor aristocracy class.

Because if counter-revolution can happen against the proletariat's class interests, then revolution can happen against the labor aristocracy's class interests. Since, in the short term, it's the latter two as a group that primarily determine the masses of people's economic views, not class interests, which are tertiary to the latter two, since the latter two are primary and secondary not as a group. But armed revolution is required when a revolutionary situation arises, otherwise it will go to waste like they have been in these countries.

There are two categories of revisionism (capitalist reformism related to communism): non-economic and economic. There are two categories of capitalist reformism (state governments increasing or decreasing policies such as nationalization, taxes, incomes, etc.): non-revisionist (non-communism related) and revisionist (communism related). Revisionism is specific, so not every regressive policy is revisionism. Each non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reform policy also has its own independent problem and must be explained separately.

Revisionist capitalist reform policies are no longer required to start building communism and are as unnecessary as feudalism reforms. Communism can't be reformed because there's no higher economic system. During communism, capitalist reforms are only revisionist and need to be opposed to prevent counter-revolution. During capitalism, capitalist reforms can be either non-revisionist and/or revisionist and can be promoted under certain conditions.

Revisionist communists, whether unconscious or conscious non-opportunists or opportunists, are anti-communists who may be anti-revisionist about some policies while being revisionist in others, as they don't all have the same beliefs. And most will use any excuse to justify revisionism such as claiming it's communism with [nation] characteristics economically, communism in our style economically, etc. even though communism is economically uniform across all nations. These are all just charades that the masses of people will eventually see through though.



During communism, revisionist communists promote non-economic and/or economic revisionism by not placing the economic relations of production above the economic forces of production, taking more than ~5 years after assuming state power to expropriate the money-capitalists, to transform the economic relations of production from for profit to for need, and to transform capitalist, feudalist, and petty private property into communist property (and while the nationalization of the agricultural sector could take longer, it still needs to be completed in a reasonable time frame), now not requiring a continuous cultural revolution, not advocating for the two-line struggle where the correct minority position should supersede the incorrect majority position, not struggling against the unresolved economic relations of production problems that arise, not struggling against communist party revisionism, not fully industrializing, not educating the masses of people about the labor aristocracy, not educating the masses of people about nationalism (because nations are especially a class policy), not struggling against the division of mental and/or physical unproductive or productive city or rural countryside labor workers where applicable and/or realistic, not struggling against the non-economic superstructure being transformed to anti-communism by revisionist communists, not struggling against the economic relations of production being transformed back to for profit from for need by revisionist communists, transforming communist property back into capitalist and petty private property, creating new money-capitalists, denationalizing and capitalizing (formerly known as privatizing) sectors and/or enterprises, creating open and/or unnationalized or closed and/or unnationalized or nationalized markets outside of temporary shortage emergencies (though this is limited as there's no (reasonable) emergency that requires creating a stock/equity market), engaging in permanent unequal exchange trade, funding counter-revolution regionally and/or globally, promoting peaceful co-existence with domestic and/or foreign money-capitalists and capitals outside of temporary united front purposes, party pluralism (building communism is a one party state), etc.

During imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism, revisionist communists promote non-economic and/or economic revisionism by supporting income increases for the labor aristocracy, claiming only a section of legal workers are labor aristocrats when it's all legal sections, claiming their legal workers are proletarians but then conveniently refusing to engage in armed revolution, not engaging in armed revolution when there's a revolutionary situation, not engaging in armed revolution when/if climate change threatens extinction, promoting the incorrect idea that non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms will lead to communism, pacifism, telling communists to perform mutual aid, etc.

During imperialist, non- or semi-labor-aristocratic or imperialized capitalism, revisionist communists promote non-economic and/or economic revisionism mainly by not engaging in armed revolution when the proletariat exists, which is a revolutionary situation.

The purpose of communism is defeating both domestic and foreign capitalism. So communists cannot blame revisionist communists, money-capitalists, or external factors for failing to build communism.

The continuous cultural revolution (which we now have the knowledge that it's needed from the beginning of building communism, and also during the initial communist revolution to prevent revisionist communists from defeating the armed revolution from within the communist party and joining the capitalist state government) is really a continuous non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production revolution based mostly on scattered policies from communists and revisionist events that preceded it. But since the term centralized most of these policies and has more brand power, it should be kept.

Communist parties, democratic centralism, two-line struggle, continuous cultural revolution, progressive communist building state, etc. are all proven practices that have helped the proletariat and the masses of people with the initial communist revolution and building communism. Those who try to reject these proven practices can be ignored because they conveniently never bother to prove their own ideas are possible. Communist parties also won't become superfluous until the progressive communist building state does. But those who think communist parties and/or these proven practices aren't required after the initial communist revolution, because they supposedly always lead to revisionism, are welcome to prove their ideas. However, they should keep in mind that certain government structures and laws aren't guarantees against revisionism.

Capitalism is a systemic issue. It mostly operates autonomously, irrespective of what money-capitalists want (which is why they can't privately own or manage capital anymore). But while money-capitalists can be held accountable for their actions, because they have agency, only challenging the capitalist system entirely with communism can transform society.

Money-capitalists, capitalist sympathizers, and revisionist communists refuse to accept reality by wanting a subjective/opinion based world, instead of objective/fact based, in order to help prevent communism from transforming society. Communists should never lie to the masses of people as they will eventually gravitate away from money-capitalists and revisionist communists to obtain the reality. So facts should be presented, not incorrect propaganda, even if it's communist based.

People refuse to accept reality through various ways, such as by not acknowledging it, by rejecting it, by accepting it but thinking it can't be changed, by accepting it but not wanting it to change, etc. And other factors can supersede facts when it comes to changing people's minds about reality, which cognitive social scientists have determined potential solutions to.

Other factors include the economic forces of production, non-economic superstructure, economic relations of production, class position, family and/or friends disapproving of political change, herd mentality, potential societal ostracization, unwillingness to abandon their current political party and/or ideology identity, unwillingness to admit being wrong, creating auxiliary/additional beliefs to try to explain away contradicting information, etc.

The potential solutions include presenting literature such as a document or book to let people change their minds at their own pace instead of confronting them in a debate, addressing entire belief systems rather than only isolated beliefs since beliefs are connected, encouraging people to join the correct ideology identity and/or reality so they're not left without any identity and/or reality, etc.

Incorrect beliefs are irrational, but the people who adopt incorrect beliefs mostly aren't irrational people. Because incorrect beliefs often arise from a set of rational human beliefs such as the rational human desire of not wanting to be ostracized from society, family, friends, etc. for having different beliefs. So communists shouldn't be arrogant when trying to change people's minds as they are and/or have been guilty of this as well. Communists should make people aware of these potential solutions and use them in their writings in order to raise awareness, and even correct themselves. Because nobody is immune from being incorrect, and learning is a never ending process that also nobody is above.

Finding communists pre-initial communist revolution is a number's game. So presenting individuals (including revisionist communists) with the correct literature, such as this manifesto, once is often sufficient recruiting, as most individuals will be lost causes. Competent money-capitalists take communism seriously because they know it'll expropriate them. So those who don't take communism seriously aren't in the conversation, though this can also be a positive as they won't bother to fight against it. But most communist sympathizers, whether anti-revisionist or non-opportunist revisionist, are too afraid to risk their lives and engage in armed revolution (communism's biggest problem). So even if someone agrees with communism, it doesn't mean they'll join an actual communist party. Communism is capitalism's replacement. But those who refuse to accept the reality about communism are unserious about this part of economism. And communists need to bring the serious masses of people and individuals who are interested in learning about communism into the economist and communist reality.

As long as classes exist, society needs to listen to its sector and/or subject matter experts. And the experts themselves shouldn't overestimate their own expertise, nor should they think they're qualified to speak about other sectors and/or subject matters they're not experts in. But it doesn't always take an expert to know if something is generally correct. For example, it's not difficult to understand that communism will replace capitalism. So communists need to make the masses of people take a mandatory class on the modern communist manifesto, along with general

knowledge information for the continuous cultural revolution, so they don't feel unqualified to criticize and overthrow revisionist communists. And the word intellectual should be replaced with sector and/or subject matter expert. Because referring to certain people as intellectuals implies that others either aren't or are anti-intellectuals, which are both incorrect since intelligence is a narrow range among humans.

General obviousness aside, communists knowing communist theory (including dialectical materialism) and knowing that capitalism compromises sector and/or subject matters, to varying degrees, doesn't make them qualified to be experts in every sector and/or subject matter. Experts often have deep disagreements with each other that outsiders with no expertise can't even understand, never mind be able to solve. So other than stating how dialectical materialism can help experts and how capitalism compromises sectors and/or subject matters, communists should refrain from speaking when they lack expertise.

Despite not having expertise in other sectors and/or subject matters, some communists promote regressive non-economic policies such as incorrectly claiming that families will disappear under communism, that anti-monogamy (post-mid-20's singleness outside of being unable to find a positive relationship/marriage, non-monogamy, polygamy, polyamory, etc.) is progressive, that the age of consent of 18 should be lowered, etc. But these are various types of social opportunists who refuse to accept reality and need to be banned from communist parties.

Families won't disappear under communism, they'll be transformed, which just means that the for profit economic relations of production under capitalism won't govern them anymore. Adults, teenagers, and children will have economic autonomy, but they'll always have the option and usually the desire to live with their family if the family environment is positive/low conflict, because various studies (which can be looked up and will prove valid across all economic systems) have proven that children and teenagers fare best when primarily raised by two biological parents in a low-conflict, monogamous marriage. So children shouldn't be allowed to be born for the purpose of not being primarily raised by their two biological parents in a low-conflict, monogamous marriage. This creates wider implications for society, but communist countries need to enforce it because it's the reality. Additionally, children and teenagers are already basically collectively raised under capitalism through classes, day/evening/night care, sports, etc. services, so there won't be any drastic changes under communism other than nationalizing these services to give parents more free time outside of work and family.

Human mating research sector and/or subject matter experts have proven that monogamy is a progressive non-economic policy for humans, while anti-monogamy is regressive. Monogamy leads to less people being excluded from the mating market (which no sane communist should object to), smaller age-gap relationships, etc. (Henrich, Joseph, Robert Boyd, and Peter Richerson. "The Puzzle of Monogamous Marriage". *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*

Society B: Biological Sciences 367, no. 1589 (2012): 657-69). Other studies have also proven that when the relationship/marriage is positive, monogamous people in relationships/marriages are happier than single people. Monogamy has historically favored the patriarchy during class society (feudalism, capitalism, and even during recent attempts at building communism). But the solution isn't anti-monogamy (which is now being promoted by capitalism in order to weaken society and help prevent communism because monogamy that favors the patriarchy is no longer sufficient for that). Instead the solution is to end the patriarchy, keep monogamy, and create a better system. Communist economism will also encourage humans to tend infinitely towards monogamy.

Lowering the age of consent to below 18 is clearly a non-economic regressive policy because it contradicts the aforementioned study on monogamy and would create even larger age-gap relationships. Various other studies have also proven that when women aren't dependent on men economically, they obviously prefer dating men who are within a couple years (0-2 years) of their own age. So if anything, the age of consent should probably be raised to the mid-20's, if not higher, with inner age brackets, to encourage young people to marry each other rather than older people, for a better functioning society. Communists should generally seek to decrease age-gap relationships, not increase them.

More studies have also proven that physical infidelity can increase through various ways, such as having a high body count (though context such as time also matters for numbers not far above the threshold), engaging in mental infidelity (viewing pornography (which also damages the brain), fantasizing about other people while in a relationship/marriage, etc.). Prostitution and pornography (including the distribution of homemade pornography with no profit intent) also need to be banned from society, as they're regressive and misogynist policies that capitalism also promotes in order to weaken society and help prevent communism.

Anyway if communists and/or experts in communism (communist experts) want a seat at the table in other sectors and/or subject matters, they need to go through the education (whether formal or if possible, self-taught), training, hypothesis experimentation (self-teaching is limited here as this often requires working with other experts, subjects/patients, professional equipment, etc.), data collection, real work, etc. that's expected out of everyone else.

During capitalism, communist-sympathizer economists have to mostly be self-taught since capitalist economism is more compromised than other sectors and/or subject matters. Most communists are semi-economists, not economists. And while they can also be economists if they desire, they shouldn't always need to be because they have to focus more on theory, politics, and militarism for actual revolution. But they still need to listen to the economists, whether they're anti-communist (revisionist communist or capitalist) or communist sympathizers, on the data because there's no point in rejecting the correct data since it can still be used for communism.

## **Anti-Regressive Economic Nationalism and Internationalism (Anti-Imperialism and Anti-Labor Aristocracy)**

Imperialism reproduces itself by monopolizing the continuous revolutionizing/developing of the economic forces of production (capitalism reproduces itself the same way but without monopolization). To achieve this monopolies set high product prices, major net economically exploit (or value capture/transfer) primarily through unequal exchange of value in trade, and use the profits and value to pay high incomes and, alongside the imperialist capitalist state, re-invest in research and development and the human forces of production.

Labor aristocrats are major net economic exploiters/consumers who receive near, at, or above the value of their labor in the form of high incomes (which can be measured on a yearly basis, or on an hourly basis to account for underemployed workers) or near high incomes and additional value. They can exist in any country, regardless if it's labor aristocratic or proletarian.

As described in Divided World Divided Class (2015) and The Wealth (Some) Nations (2019), high incomes are those which are incrementally above the median value of labor-power globally. And at the extreme end of the scale, high incomes are those which are near, at, or above the global per capita value of labor (average allowable income with no surplus content), or the global maximum income beyond which no surplus value is created.

### **2012 USD Global Rate of Economic Exploitation Calculation**

---

Average Income in Imperialist, Labor-Aristocratic, Capitalist Countries/ILACC ( $v_1$ )	\$40,596
Average Income in Imperialized Capitalist Countries/ICC ( $v_2$ )	\$8,208
Total Full-Time Equivalent Workforce in ILACC ( $P_1$ )	458M
Total Full-Time Equivalent Workforce in ICC ( $P_2$ )	1.29B
Total Income Costs for ILACC ( $V_1 = P_1 v_1$ )	\$18.6T
Total Income Costs for ICC ( $V_2 = P_2 v_2$ )	\$10.6T
Total Income Costs for World ( $V$ )	\$29.2T
GDP of ILACC ( $W_1$ )	\$48.6T
GDP of ICC ( $W_2$ )	\$27.2T
World GDP ( $W$ )	\$75.8T
Total Surplus Value ( $S = W - V$ )	\$46.6T
Global Rate of Economic Exploitation ( $E = S/V$ )	1.6

Global Median Value of Labor-Power/Median Income ( $V_x$ )	\$16,200
Global Per Capita Value of Labor/Maximum Income Beyond Which No Surplus Value is Created ( $M = V_x E$ )	\$25,920
Factor by Which Average ILACC Workers are Exploited ( $E_1 = M/v_1$ )	-1.6
Factor by Which Average ICC Workers are Exploited ( $E_2 = M/v_2$ )	3.2

---

Source: (Modified) Table 8.6 from The Wealth of (Some) Nations (2019).

And as described in Lenin's Theory of Imperialism Today (2018) and Imperialism and the Development Myth (2021), one other method of measuring incomes (and countries', money-capitalists', and workers' economic status and global power) is with GDP per capita. It compares the world market value (price) of labor product per person (value capture, not creation), which translates to a close estimation of per worker per hour, as there's a correlation between the size of a country's population and workforce. This is sufficient provided a country's GDP per capita and average (and/or median) income aren't drastically different, in which case if imperialist money-capitalists have managed to decrease their labor aristocracy's incomes then the latter should be used. With that in mind, GDP per capita income bracket, (world share percentage %), and [net] categories can determine if a country (and worker) is labor aristocratic or proletarian, as long as it's within the correct income bracket, which should be defined by clustering of where countries are positioned by their GDP per capita and can change every year.

#### 2015 USD GDP Per Capita Calculation

---

##### **Labor Aristocratic (High Income):**

\$50,001+ (5.1%), \$42,001-\$50,000 (2.1%), \$34,001-\$42,000 (4.2%), \$25,001-\$34,000 (2.2%)  
[major net economic exploiter imperialist 1-4]

##### **Proletarian (Middle or Low Income):**

\$15,701-\$25,000 (1.4%) [intermediate net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized]  
\$11,351-\$15,700 (2.1%) [minor net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized]  
\$7,001-\$11,350 (27.4%) [minor net economic exploited semi-imperialist/imperialized]  
\$3,001-\$7,000 (12.8%) [major net economic exploited imperialized 2]  
\$1-\$3,000 (42.8%) [major net economic exploited imperialized 1]

---

Source: (Modified) Table 1.2 from Imperialism and the Development Myth (2021).

Since the two tables display similar enough results despite any differences (year, productivity assumptions, etc.), an alternative shortcut method using global GDP per capita can also produce

comparable results to the two tables. Figures slightly,  $\sim 1.5x$ , and  $\sim 2.5x$  above the global GDP per capita represent the minor net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized, intermediate net economic exploiter semi-imperialist/imperialized (global median value of labor-power/median income), and major net economic exploiter imperialist (global per capita value of labor/maximum income beyond which no surplus value is created/high income) thresholds, respectively. Additionally, the purpose of imperialism is major net economic exploitation, so countries that meet this criterion are imperialist (and countries that don't aren't) even if they don't personally engage in other imperialist categories such as global non-economic military imperialism, because they indirectly benefit from these other categories that help them maintain the criterion regardless.

Products, incomes (labor-power), etc. can sell and/or exchange below, at, or above their value due to various factors. Hence economic exploitation occurring under capitalism (under communism, and barring considerable unfavorable trade, debt, etc. with other countries, workers don't receive the full value of their labor, but it's not economic exploitation because the surplus goes towards the necessity of building and maintaining society instead of the money-capitalists). Value consists of constant capital (non-value creating machinery, materials, raw materials, etc.), variable capital (value creating living human labor-power, and the price/cost of it through income paid), surplus value (difference between the socially necessary labor time required to produce the materials for the worker's reproduction compared with the socially necessary labor time the worker expends, or basically the value of a worker's income and the value they create while working; so it's not the difference between income and the final product price), etc.

Counter-arguments (in either direction) such as productivity, surplus value creation, cost of living (mostly), etc. also still don't negate the fact that workers in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries receive near, at, or above the value of their labor because of imperialism.

Collectively, the legal workers in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries are labor aristocrats who only have high incomes, a high standard of living, and high consumption because they major net economically exploit workers in imperialized capitalist countries. And collectively, they're not economically exploited. Near the lower end of the major and upper end of the intermediate net economic exploiter parts of the threshold, where high incomes are less established, semi-labor-aristocratic/proletarian capitalist country situations do exist. And while the proletariat could be more inclined towards imperialist capitalism than communism due to being intermediate net economic exploiters, communism remains very realistic.

Additional value is difficult to measure precisely, hence the usage of the term collectively, but some (most are near, at, or above) of the legal workers in the imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries who are below the major net economic income threshold, again whether on a yearly or hourly basis, can still receive additional value that can make up difference through



other imperialist welfare and theft methods (besides high incomes) such as non-government or government services and infrastructure, help from family and/or friends, inheritances, investments, pensions, healthcare, etc.

The legal nations in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries may experience other types of oppression such as regressive non-economic and/or economic, non-exploitative oppression, but collectively, they do not experience regressive economic, exploitative oppression. Because they're regressive economic, exploitative oppressor nations. And this is regressive economic nationalism and internationalism for two main reasons. One, because while it may seem like it's progressive economically for the nation benefiting from economic exploitation, it's still regressive economically because regressive economic, exploitative oppression shouldn't exist in a progressive society. And two, because overall, it's not communism, and nations need to move past capitalism, which is overall regressive economically now that communism is possible.

Workers economically exploiting workers across countries is less accepted because it's more obfuscated than other types of economic exploitation. Most people and/or revisionist communists in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries incorrectly think that their high incomes won't end by their country turning communist, by imperialism shifting to other capitalist countries, by countries ceasing trade with them, etc. But those who refuse to accept the reality about the labor aristocracy are unserious about this part of economism. And communists need to bring the serious masses of people and individuals who are interested in learning about the labor aristocracy into the economist, anti-labor aristocracy, and anti-revisionist communist reality.

There are currently four categories of standard of living for countries: high (imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism), medium (communism), medium (imperialized capitalism), and low (imperialized capitalism).

One method of ending imperialism (and its labor aristocracy's high incomes) is that imperialized capitalist countries could cease trade (decouple/delink) (more likely to occur if they turn communist first to raise their standard of living from low to medium, or medium imperialized capitalism to medium communism in order to acquire a guaranteed living) with imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, which will drop the latter's standard of living, along with their high incomes, from high to medium or low, making the initial communist revolution there more likely since the workers would then become proletarians.

Another possible method is that, presumably due to humanity crossing certain technology thresholds, imperialized capitalist countries could prevent monopolies from forming and monopolizing the continuous revolutionizing of the economic forces of production by rapidly copying, scaling, and/or improving production at a lower cost, which wouldn't give monopolies enough time to secure high product prices and reproduce imperialism; resulting in an

equalization of average profit rates, an equal GDP per capita and average income level, and close to full industrialization for all capitalist countries.

In the long term and distant future, communism will offer a higher standard of living than even imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism, because its progressive for need economic relations of production is superior at revolutionizing the economic forces of production compared to capitalism's for profit economic relations of production, which stifles innovation and robs humans of their purpose with its consumerism. So capitalist sympathizers are ultimately anti-technological progress.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms like higher incomes, higher standard of living, higher consumption, and additional value for the collective labor aristocrats need to be opposed outside of prudently struggling against imperialism and capitalism as they're regressive economically and they reject, downplay, or ignore the fact that in these countries the ongoing blanket support helps preserve imperialism and capitalism. But in imperialized capitalist countries, non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms like higher incomes, higher standard of living, higher consumption, and additional value need to be supported for non-labor aristocrats as they're progressive economically and they weaken imperialism and the labor aristocracy's incomes. In both cases it still needs to be stated that non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms don't lead to communism though.

The point of recognizing the existence of the collective labor aristocracy (and/or settler nation) is to create new strategies to bypass it for the initial communist revolution such as encouraging labor aristocrats to use communism to produce for need and better combat climate change, to avoid capitalist crises such as mass unemployment from the economic forces of production improvements, to acquire a higher standard of living than imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism if communism manages offer it in the near future, to think long term since high incomes are unstable, to have sympathy for the imperialized capitalist countries, to realize that having a medium standard of living as masters of their own fate is better than having a high standard of living as servants/doormats to imperialist money-capitalists, to stop national replacement with progressive non-economic nationalism, etc.

Though these strategies require communist parties actually telling their workers that they're labor aristocrats whose incomes will decrease, prudently using their protests for higher incomes, anti-immigration nationalism, etc. to struggle against imperialism and capitalism, and engaging in armed revolution without a proletariat.

(Building) communism in one country, and not an instant world permanent revolution or a world communist party, is the strategy for various reasons such as uneven incomes, communism being a nationalist struggle at first and an internationalist struggle second (or since multi-nation

countries exist, a countryist (nationalist and domestic internationalist) struggle first, and an intercountryist (global internationalist) struggle second), communism needing to build its power first before rejecting peaceful co-existence with foreign money-capitalists and capitals outside of temporary united fronts, etc. In the present/modern day, it's usually pacifist opportunists and revisionist communists who refuse to engage in armed revolution in their own countries that promote internationalism (or intercountryism/global internationalism) first.

When countries have an equal GDP per capita and average income level, unequal exchange is impossible since all trade becomes equal exchange. In the long term, the goal is to defeat capitalism by ceasing all trade with it. In the short term, communist countries can unequal exchange in favor of the higher GDP per capita and average income level capitalist countries (it can be in favor of either) when they trade with them (if necessary), but they should unequal exchange in favor of the lower GDP per capita and average income level capitalist or communist countries when they trade with them in order to avoid for profit trade revisionism. Former imperialist capitalist countries should pay reparations to imperialized capitalist countries. Full industrialization when building communism should be required to counter being used as colonies to extract raw materials, even if trade is offered as equal exchange.

Communist parties in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries that don't explicitly state that collectively, their legal workers are labor aristocrats, should be avoided, because this error is split worthy since they're imperialist revisionist communists benefiting from imperialism.

However, in these countries there are other considerations that must be taken into account. Because there are different types of revisionist communists who believe different things and the initial communist revolution, again, isn't just an academic affair where every box has to be checked. For building communism, the following four policies are required within ~5 years of assuming state power: placing the economic relations of production above the economic forces of production, expropriating the money-capitalists, transforming the economic relations of production from for profit to for need, and transforming capitalist, feudal, and petty private property into communist property. But other scenarios must be factored in these countries to combat the labor aristocracy and even produce the initial communist revolution.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, if an anti-revisionist, communist-sympathizer party is anti-labor aristocracy, doesn't plan to engage in armed revolution until there's a proletariat (even when there's a revolutionary situation), and is in agreement with the above four policies, then these types of parties just aren't communists yet so it's up to the individual communist sympathizer to decide if they should or shouldn't avoid them.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, if a revisionist communist party is anti-labor aristocracy, engages in armed revolution, and is not in agreement with the above four policies,

then they shouldn't be avoided. Because they're still going to end the labor aristocracy, though after they'll need to be overthrown by an anti-revisionist communist party.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, if a revisionist communist party refuses to accept the reality about the labor aristocracy, engages in armed revolution (they should be avoided until they do, but if communist sympathizers want to join them they should first try to determine if they'll actually engage in armed revolution so they don't waste their time with pacifists), and is in agreement with the above four policies, then they shouldn't be avoided. Because their country's high GDP per capita and average income level would likely drastically decrease in a capitalist world, so they wouldn't be able to maintain their labor aristocracy's high incomes anyway, the labor aristocracy would end regardless. This type of party wouldn't need to be overthrown afterwards unless they refuse to stop engaging in permanent unequal exchange trade, especially with lower GDP per capita and average income level countries.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, if a revisionist communist party refuses to accept the reality about the labor aristocracy, engages in armed revolution, and is not in agreement with the above four policies, then they should be avoided. Because their country's high GDP per capita and average income level would likely remain intact and they'll continue to maintain their labor aristocracy.

Communist parties in imperialized capitalist countries that don't explicitly state that collectively, the legal workers in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries are labor aristocrats, shouldn't be avoided, because while they should correct this error, it's not split worthy since they're not imperialist revisionist communists benefiting from imperialism.

There are two categories of settlerism: non-economic and economic.

There are three sub-categories of non-economic and economic settlerism: feudalism, capitalism, and communism.

There are two sub-sub-categories of settlerism: non-violent and violent.

There are two sub-sub-sub-categories of non-violent and violent settlerism, which can oscillate: unestablished and established formerly (violent or violently enslaved).

There is one sub-sub-sub-sub-category of non-violent and violent settlerism: short-term host nation status.

Oscillation and short-term host nation status are determined by various factors.

For non-violent settler nations, they're determined by whether a nation has a semi-land claim in a country. For example, if a non-violent nation has a semi-land claim, then it's a non-violent established settler nation with short-term host nation status.

For violent settler nations, they're determined by whether a nation is actively and physically genociding/killing the host nation, enacting apartheid, etc. For example, if a violent settler nation has no reason to continue actively and physically genociding the host nation because they've abandoned apartheid and accepted the host nation's people as legal citizens in the newly violent established formerly violent settler state (meaning the host nation's people are no longer illegal and/or semi-legal, like they were when the settler state was violent unestablished), then it's a violent established formerly violent settler nation with short-term host nation status.

There are various categories of labor-aristocratic nations, which may (split by the word "and" if they are) or may not be in combination with each other: single-nation, multi-nation and host, non-violent settler, violent settler.

The host nation labor aristocracy is the "native" nation in a country that has become labor aristocratic (native is in quotes because no people are actually native to any land). The non-violent settler nation labor aristocracy has non-violently settled. The violent settler nation labor aristocracy has violently settled. The multi-nation labor aristocracy can be all these nations.

There can be more than one host, non-violent, and/or violent settler nation in a country. And depending on the situation, either the host, non-violent, or violent settler nation can be in charge of the country. The violent settler nation problem can be solved through various ways such as the host nation taking back state control, the violent settler nation being defeated in a war by another country, the violent settler nation being national resemblance replaced by non-violent settler-immigration (though this doesn't solve the non-violent settler nation problem), etc. This manifesto has expanded some of the settlerism concepts from Settlers (1983).

The non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production as a group, and their categories, still primarily determine the masses of people's economic views, but while it, as a group, can technically always be considered the primary contradiction, untechnically the primary contradiction can change depending on a country's non-economic and/or economic conditions. And to an extent both a country's non-economic superstructure and subsequent economic relations of production as a group and a country's non-economic and/or economic conditions can be a wash since they can mimic each other at any given time.

But to get to the point, the primary contradiction in any country can vary. It's not always between the domestic money-capitalists vs. the proletariat, where an internal temporary united front, combining one into two with non-communist parties, isn't needed (united fronts can take many

forms and can include or exclude various classes, but it's up to communists to decide such inclusions or exclusions in order to best fight the primary contradiction, because sometimes the imperialized money-capitalists could either be too weak to help the proletariat or uninterested in helping the proletariat or communists since doing so would threaten their class interests). Additionally, there are primary, secondary, tertiary, etc. contradictions of varying difficulties in countries that stack/compound and make the initial communist revolution more of a challenge.

In imperialist capitalist countries, the primary contradiction can vary.

If, collectively, the legal workers from the host and/or non-violent and/or violent established formerly violent settler nation(s) in an imperialist capitalist country are labor aristocrats, then the primary contradiction is that the nation(s) will try to defend imperialism.

If, collectively, the legal workers from the host and/or non-violent and/or violent established formerly violent settler nation(s) in an imperialist capitalist country are labor aristocrats, but the in charge host or violent established formerly violent settler nations turn against imperialism, then the primary contradiction is that the not in charge host and/or non-violent settler nation(s) will try to defend imperialism with the help of the imperialist money-capitalists by scapegoating the in charge host or violent established formerly violent settler nation(s).

If, collectively, only the legal workers from the host or either violent unestablished or established formerly violent settler nation(s) in an imperialist capitalist country are labor aristocrats, then the primary contradiction is that in charge host or either violent unestablished or established formerly violent settler nation(s) will try to defend imperialism by scapegoating the other non-labor-aristocratic nations.

In imperialized capitalist countries, the primary contradiction can also vary.

If, collectively, the legal workers from the host and/or non-violent and/or violent established formerly violent settler nation(s) in an imperialized capitalist country aren't labor aristocrats, then the primary contradiction is that the nation(s) is being economically exploited.

If, collectively, the legal workers from the host and/or non-violent and/or violent established formerly violent settler nation(s) in an imperialized capitalist country aren't labor aristocrats, but there's an inter-imperialized war occurring, then the primary contradiction is said war.

If, collectively, the legal workers from the host and/or non-violent and/or violent unestablished settler nation(s) in an imperialized capitalist country aren't labor aristocrats, then the primary contradiction is that the in charge violent unestablished settler nation(s) will try to defend violent settlerism by scapegoating the not in charge host and/or non-violent settler nation(s) if they don't

want to give up any and/or all the land they stole. These are violent unestablished settler proletarians who have more to lose than just their chains.

Additionally, for the imperialized capitalist countries that are semi-feudalist, imperialist economic exploitation is tied in with semi-feudalism as the primary contradiction. Because imperialist capitalism has a vested interest in preventing these countries from developing out of semi-feudalism in order to keep them weak so they're easier to economically exploit and unable to challenge imperialism in a future regressive inter-imperialist offensive war.

As previously stated, imperialism can be in either the capitalist or feudal economic system. Imperialist capitalism exists now. Imperialist feudalism existed in the past. Imperialist communism obviously isn't possible. And as also previously stated, settlerism can exist in any economic system, so non-violent and/or maybe violent settler communism might be possible in a space colonization setting. Non-violent settler communism is certain since humans will leave the Earth someday. Violent settler communism is uncertain, but unlikely since by that time communist societies should be able to resolve issues with each other without violence.

During regressive inter-imperialist offensive wars (whether military, trade, etc. wars) between warring capitalist countries that want to stay or become imperialist (while very difficult, imperialism shifting to other capitalist countries shouldn't be ruled out), communists should focus on exploiting the situation for domestic, initial communist revolution and supporting imperialized capitalist countries that need the most immediate help (warring money-capitalists are going to fight regardless, so communists don't need to compromise their principles to chase a never ending cycle of supporting and then opposing (new) imperialist capitalist countries), while stating that only progressive non-economic and/or economic nationalism and internationalism can solve these wars, which includes communism since these wars can only be solved by it by eliminating the profit motive. This can also apply to imperialist-imperialized and inter-imperialized wars as well, but those usually can be solved without communism since one side is usually acting in defense. And in all cases, recognition of offense vs. defense is crucial.

Complications arise due to various factors such as warring money-capitalists are probably needed for most of communism's initial revolutions, imperialism shifting also leads to new, progressive global economic gains (initial end of serfdom and slavery/initial birth of the proletariat, initial end of colonialism/initial global expansion of the nation-state, etc.), countries that want to become imperialist speaking out against the golden billion (term for labor aristocrats and non-labor/non-feudal aristocrats in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries only), countries preferring to lose these wars and become imperialized so national replacement (primarily caused by imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism's high incomes and non-violent settler-immigration) shifts away from their nation to the winners, which only moves the problem (although this shifting could be a temporary form of progressive internationalism to save

nations), scenarios where having more labor-aristocratic countries at lower incomes compared to having less at higher incomes is uncertain if it would be progressive or regressive economically, etc. But the instructions from the previous paragraph remain correct despite these complications.

Imperialized capitalist countries should turn communist. But if they can't, in the meantime they should pursue temporary progressive defensive capitalism (promote trade ceaseure with imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries globally, promote equal exchange trade to raise awareness globally, promote guaranteeing food (and water) globally, promote a global minimum income, primarily trade with countries that have a similar GDP per capita and average income level for optimal development, set up a tax/tariff on exports, provide each other with welcomed (unwelcomed should be opposed) military support against regressive imperialist regime change efforts, physical genocides, etc., etc.).

These are non-revisionist and/or revisionist capitalist reforms, but they weaken imperialism and/or the labor aristocracy. So communist countries should help these countries as well. Communist countries should also inform their communist army members they're fighting for imperialized capitalism (semi-communism/capitalism (revisionist communism), capitalism, semi-capitalism/feudalism, etc.), and not actual communism, where applicable in global pre- or post-initial communist revolution country situations, because the distinction is important to those risking their lives.

The labor aristocracy (and/or settler) topics need to be discussed to help prevent incorrect capitalist propaganda from portraying capitalism as a better option to communism. Some think labor aristocrats also shouldn't have to bear responsibility for imperialist capitalism since it's a systemic issue, but this anti-accountability mindset is incorrect because it incorrectly assumes that workers, whether labor aristocratic or proletarian, have no agency, when they do.

Communist parties in both imperialized capitalist countries and communist countries need to teach their proletarian workers that labor-aristocratic workers in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries only have high incomes, a high standard of living, and high consumption because they major net economically exploit proletarian workers in imperialized capitalist countries (in imperialized capitalist countries only, they need to tell their proletarians that they're not only being economically exploited by domestic and foreign money-capitalists, but also by domestic and especially foreign labor aristocrats who comprise entire countries) and that the labor aristocracy won't last, so they shouldn't pursue being labor aristocrats (in communist countries they also need to make this non-labor aristocracy pursual concept part of the continuous cultural revolution's general knowledge). Because this lack of education is part of the reason that the initial communist revolution in imperialized capitalist countries is taking so long to complete and also part of the reason that building communism in communist countries failed.



### **Progressive Non-Economic Nationalism and Internationalism (Nations)**

Progressive non-economic nationalism and internationalism are when single-nation countries form an alliance. Progressive economic nationalism and internationalism are communism, domestic and global.

Internationalism isn't possible without nationalism. It's in the name, inter-nationalism. Hyphenation should really be the standard form for a better explanation. Internationalism is not cosmopolitanism, interpatritism, or intercountryism. One can't be a progressive internationalist without also being a progressive nationalist.

Progressive nationalism isn't just for combatting imperialism and violent settlerism, it's also needed for both the initial communist revolution and building communism. So communists always need to promote progressive nationalism, even in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries to show the masses of people that progressive nationalism is against regressive non-economic and economic oppression, since nationalism isn't inherently regressive.

Merely recognizing the existence of nations automatically makes someone a nationalist, and not only a sympathizer, since everyone can claim a nation anyway. But those who refuse to accept the reality about progressive nationalism are unserious about this part of nationalism. And communists need to bring the serious masses of people and individuals who are interested in learning about progressive nationalism into the nationalist reality.

A nation is historical psychological resemblance constitution and language. Basically one has to look (on a national basis) and speak the part. Analyzing geopolitics correctly requires the correct nation definition.

What's commonly referred to as racism is actually regressive non-economic and/or economic oppression from one nation to another on the basis of resemblance, though any oppression where nations of different resemblances are involved could be considered that, as the basis doesn't have to be explicitly stated. And no nation is inherently anti-oppressive or oppressive.

It's not possible to be loyal to two nations, so people who are mixed resemblance and/or language need to continue transforming their nationality. The way to transform resemblance is to have an offspring that's less mixed. The way to transform language is to prioritize one. Resemblance and language ancestry are irrelevant because of transformation.

People and languages preceded class society, so they, alongside nations, exist outside of the non-economic superstructure and economic relations of production and economic forces of production. This doesn't contradict the fact that nations (and nationalism) have relational non-economic and economic categories, because it's referring to the nations themselves and not

the nations' non-economic policies such as single- or multi-nation countries. But nations are about the people's resemblance and language; not about the non-economic superstructure, economic relations of production, economic forces of production, class, current land, oppression status, type of government system, culture, ancestry, etc. So nations aren't a product of economism. Feudalist countries had nations. As did tribal entities. And while nations have been separated into different countries (whether communist or capitalist, labor aristocratic or proletarian) by economism, it doesn't mean the separation changed them into different nations.

If communists believe that nations are part of the capitalist relational non-economic superstructure that will eventually disappear under communism or if they believe that all nations will willingly transform themselves into one nation with the same resemblance and language in order to centralize humans more (in this scenario, resemblance would lose its category as a nation divider since the human race would cover that), then they still need to promote progressive non-economic nationalism now during the "age of nations." Because even if either of these two scenarios are the case in the future, where nations either won't exist or will become one nation, nations are still required to get those cases, so there's no excuse for communists not to promote progressive non-economic nationalism now. And also because, again, nations are especially a class policy, so it's a contradiction for communists to think nationalism is beneath them.

If especially unserious communists reject the concept of nations and/or national borders altogether because they're social constructs, then they should be consistent and also reject other social constructs like languages, as in they should stop using languages to communicate so we don't have to hear from them anymore. Communist countries need borders to defend against capitalist countries anyway, because the communist revolution won't happen everywhere at once.

There are various methods used to reject certain nations and nationalisms such as referring to nations as ethnicities, people of color, communities, etc. and referring to nationalism as populism, patriotism, [economic system] with [nation] characteristics non-economically, etc. But these are just more charades the masses of people will eventually see through though.

A mixture of merger, secession, population transfer relocation, reverse transformation, transformation, remigration, etc. policies need to be utilized to create single-nation countries and solve the national question worldwide. If applicable, nations can form one connected country on separate continents. If nations split for economic reasons, then they should eventually merge back into the more progressive economic system. Resemblance and/or language merger and independence for nations, which in addition to communism, are required for complete 3/3 progressive non-economic and economic nationalism. And although not preferred, violent national independence and mergers are therefore progressive policies that should be supported.

Communism and capitalism are economic systems, and in the short term they can be either single- or multi-nation. But single-nation countries are a progressive non-economic policy because nations should have their own countries. Multi-nation countries and/or states and/or unions are therefore a regressive non-economic policy (which despite being regressive is not revisionism because it's not capitalist reformism related to communism), and an (international) alliance needs to be formed instead. Additionally, single-nation countries are not apartheid, segregation, oppression, supremacy, etc. for various obvious reasons, but also because they're not inherently oppressive.

Not allowing secession of nations is regressive non-economic and/or economic oppression. All non-settler host nations, regardless if they're oppressors or oppressed, should pursue secession as it can be struggled for separately in the short term. Some communists promote secession for one non-economic and/or economic oppressor or oppressed nation, while denying it for another, in order to benefit communism or progressive economism. And some communists have wanted communist multi-nation countries and/or states and/or unions to counter the capitalist ones and national chauvinism. But these reasons treat nations as pawns. And they aren't even the best solutions, because denying secession can also damage communism and progressive economism, and because communist single-nation countries with an alliance can also better counter capitalist multi-nation countries and/or states and/or unions and national chauvinism since an alliance doesn't require nations to border each other.

Transformation is not regressive oppression if nations want to willingly transform their nationality, which some nations should do to be realistic (nations that are close in resemblance and language, nations that don't have any desire to govern themselves, etc.). Reverse transformation is also acceptable for nations and/or part of nations that want to transform their resemblance and/or language, as long as they have a valid land claim.

Since progressive occupation is not the same as annexation into a multi-nation country and/or state and/or union, capitalist countries can be occupied in the short term for valid reasons, with the long term goal of ending the occupation. Nations refusing to pay reparations after starting imperialist wars, rejecting peaceful co-existence by overthrowing foreign money-capitalists and capitals outside of temporary united fronts in other countries to complete the initial communist revolution, etc. constitute valid reasons. There is, however, no justification to regressively occupy anti-revisionist communist single-nation countries.

Non-violent settler-immigration is caused by imperialist capitalism (and even semi-imperialist/imperialized capitalism) for various non-economic and/or economic reasons such as permanent or temporary domestic labor that's potentially cheaper and/or easier to control/deport, propping up the economy by filling jobs, using national-resemblance diversity to help prevent the initial communist revolution and criticism of imperialism and capitalism,

weakening the current nation(s) land claims to prevent them from being against immigration, pacifying global workers by offering them a chance to move and become labor aristocrats, etc.

Violent settler-immigration is caused for other and similar non-economic and/or economic reasons.

A nation becomes a host nation when it has a valid claim on land to live on. Non-violent and violent settler nations can, and in the past have, become host nations. In the short term, settler nations with short-term host nation status should be allowed to form potentially temporary single-nation countries to set a path for progress. In the long term, settler nations can only keep their single-nation countries with permission from the host nation, if the host nation hasn't been transformed to the point of no return (usually resemblance only, as language can always be revived), because settler nations are limiting the growth of the host nations. So settler nations must accept remigration as an option if permission to stay isn't granted to help end the forced settler mentality, which a future communist world won't allow anyway.

National replacement of host nations through non-violent settler-immigration, violent settler-immigration, and annexation are incorrectly supported in the name of economism to build communism in those host countries by using immigration to potentially lower the labor aristocracy's incomes, to build capitalism or communism in those settled countries, and to counter imperialism at the expense of the annexed country, respectively. When multiple host nations' immediate independence are at stake on both sides of a conflict, communists can advocate for single-nation countries. It's regressive internationalism to ask host nations to sacrifice themselves. This doesn't apply to non-violent or violent settler nations.

When nations grow at the expense of other nations (through various methods such as imperialism, violent settler-immigration, or capitalist and even communist multi-nation country and/or state and/or union forced transformation, since it can happen in either economic system) it may seem like it's progressive non-economic and/or economic oppression (progressive nationalism) for themselves, but it's still regressive non-economic and/or economic oppression (regressive nationalism) because it shouldn't exist in a progressive society, since it's regressive non-economic and/or economic internationalism (regressive internationalism) for the other nations; and nations need to promote both progressive non-economic and/or economic nationalism and internationalism.

National-resemblance replacement from proportionally considerable non-violent settler-immigration is a statistically irrefutable phenomenon that needs to be opposed, as it's regressive non-economic and/or economic, non-exploitative oppression on the host nation. It's a systemic issue primarily caused by imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism's high incomes (imperialist, labor-aristocratic nations' national resemblances are decreasing while imperialized

nations' are increasing). Because if all countries had an equal GDP per capita and average income level, national-resemblance replacement wouldn't be a risk.

Those who don't discuss national-resemblance replacement (or demographic decline for those unwilling to accept resemblance as a nation divider) are refusing to accept reality. Communists who don't discuss it, but support immigration to lower the labor aristocracy's incomes, are especially being dishonest. But those who refuse to accept the reality about national-resemblance replacement are unserious about this part of economism, nationalism, and internationalism. And communists need to bring the serious masses of people and individuals who are interested in learning about national-resemblance replacement into the progressive non-economic and economic nationalist and internationalist reality.

Some claim that using non-violent settler-immigration to lower incomes can alone end the imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries (and their high incomes), but this is uncertain and unrealistic for various reasons.

The current slow, but proportionally considerable non-violent settler-immigration ending them in any time frame is uncertain because the wage (income) elasticity of immigration varies among countries. Non-violent settler-immigration can raise, lower, lower only the previous non-violent settler-immigrants', lower only certain sectors', have little to no effect on, etc. incomes. So economically, it can definitely benefit labor aristocrats more than it hurts them .

Completely open borders with no work permit restrictions might end them in a reasonable time frame, which could be supported because national-resemblance replacement wouldn't be a risk since it would lead to overcrowding rather than replacement, with remigration following after. But for various reasons the imperialist money-capitalists haven't even tried to do it, presumably because like communism, capitalism also requires borders to sustain itself, making it unrealistic.

So the certain, main way to end the imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries permanently is by imperialized capitalist countries turning communist and ceasing trade with them.

The only certain, well-intentioned reasons to be pro-non-violent settler-immigration is to continue to have sympathy towards non-violent settler-immigrants who were surplus to labor requirements in their countries and would've died if they didn't move, and to continue remittances, which help people that can't move. Each year 10-20 million people (mostly women, teenagers, and children) die in major net economic exploited imperialized capitalist countries from social murder starvation (mostly direct starvation but also diseases as a result of starvation) primarily caused by imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, which is more than a lot of the latter nations' populations, war casualties, physical genocides, etc.

As previously mentioned, if regressive non-economic and/or economic oppressors are advocating for progressive non-economic policies, then the preferred position generally is to criticize them for being regressive oppressors, while still supporting the progressive non-economic policies they're advocating for. Though this decision can vary non-internally (externally) and internally for the masses of people and communists in imperialist and imperialized capitalist countries.

In imperialized capitalist countries, the masses of people may choose to either support, denounce, or ignore progressive non-economic policies in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, which is their decision, and others shouldn't have a say in it, so as not to diminish their anti-imperialist struggle. Though imperialism and the labor aristocracy are systemic issues and no nation or woman is inherently anti-imperialist or imperialist. And mentioning this isn't meant to absolve labor aristocrats of their responsibility and guilt for imperialism, but rather to highlight that their non-economic struggles are at least worthy of consideration. Plus proletarians could find themselves in the same position one day if their countries become imperialist, labor aristocratic like some already have. But again, it's their decision.

In imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries, the masses of people need to support all progressive non-economic policies. They can't choose certain ones over others, because it would be inconsistent due to the fact that they're all complicit in imperialism and the aforementioned social murder starvation. They can all rightfully be accused of just wanting better living conditions under imperialism. Because the only way to be consistent is to either support, denounce, or ignore them all. Labor-aristocratic nations and women will have to fight for the progressive non-economic policies themselves when they don't have any support though.

In imperialist and imperialized capitalist countries, communists should stick to criticizing regressive policies and leave the masses of people in imperialized capitalist countries to decide if they want to criticize progressive non-economic policies in imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries. Because while communism can be a thankless job, especially pre-initial communist revolution, the masses of people don't owe anything to anybody, not to communists or money-capitalists. So communists expecting the masses of people, whether they're labor aristocratic or proletarian, to stop advocating for progressive non-economic policies is insulting. People have been advocating for progressive non-economic policies regardless of the economic system longer than communists have been around, and will continue to do so long after the communists are gone. Women especially, so the last thing even labor-aristocratic women need is to be treated as pawns and/or referred to as pseudo-feminists by communists.

And also part of the systemic issue is that allowing non-violent settler-immigration can't end the aforementioned social murder starvation problem for various reasons such as imperialism wanting diverse non-violent settler-immigrants instead of just ones from major net economic exploited imperialized capitalist countries, it being impossible to identify the correct non-violent settler-immigrants who are struggling since some take up spots and move just because they want to be labor aristocrats, etc. And since it can't end it, national-resemblance replacement is unnecessary. Under global capitalism, promoting guaranteeing food globally should be prioritized to help end the previously aforementioned social murder starvation problem since it could be more likely than other anti-imperialist policies.

Immigration under capitalism has too many contradictions. People oppose violent settler-immigrants who are also surplus to labor requirements in their countries. And while same-national-resemblance immigration doesn't cause national-resemblance replacement, even it won't happen en masse during global communism. Additionally, expecting future communist countries to take in non-violent settler-immigrants creates various implications such as expecting communists to absorb capitalism's problems, encouraging emigrants to abandon their nation instead of staying to fight for communism, etc.

National-resemblance replacement, while currently occurring, is uncertain if it will be outpaced by transformation. Because a lot of non-violent settler-immigrants tend to transform their resemblance nationality into the host nation's. And while proportionally considerable non-violent settler-immigration ending while imperialist, labor-aristocratic capitalism's high incomes exist is unlikely; the policy can be for host nations to oppose it, while at the same time (and contingent on the host nation still having a large enough population (~75% of the country) to support transformation without risking national-resemblance replacement) instructing non-violent settler-immigrants to transform themselves, and their eventual offspring, into the resemblance national category; otherwise they shouldn't produce offspring, though they can still marry.

This policy can help prevent national-resemblance replacement and differentiate/extend empathy to non-violent settler-immigrants serious about transforming their resemblance nationality. And while some argue that voicing restrictions on non-violent settler-immigrants' offspring options is unfair because imperialism forced some of them to move, these arguments are unreasonable and help replace host nations, which is both anti-progressive nationalism and internationalism. If climate change renders countries uninhabitable, then land for separate countries and short-term host nation status can be temporarily offered instead of transformation.

Regressive non-economic and/or economic, non-exploitative oppression on the current legal minority nations by the in charge host and/or violent established formerly violent settler majority nations are disappearing in the imperialist, labor-aristocratic, and/or violent established formerly violent settler capitalist countries. Because as a result of national-resemblance replacement, the

personnel spots in politics, law enforcement, etc. are becoming increasingly filled by the current legal minority nations themselves. But again, no nation is inherently anti-imperialist or imperialist, so imperialism will continue regardless of who's the majority.

Imperialist capitalism can also oscillate between national-resemblance single-nation countries (homogeneity) and multi-nation countries (diversity) whenever either suits its purpose more for survival against communism, anti-imperialism, proletarianization, nationalism/host nation backlash, non-economic (societal) and/or economic decline (when non-violent settler-immigrants become non-economic and/or economic liabilities because they can't adapt), etc.

During diversity, most imperialist money-capitalists and capitals are anti-resemblance, but pro-language category nationalism, so they have little use for the in charge host and/or violent established formerly violent settler resemblance category nations. Diversity is also clearly preferred when issues are minimal, thus any change to homogeneity would likely only be temporary. And even in forced depopulation situations (most likely due to the economic forces of production improvements), diversity would likely still be desired for the remaining population.

Pre-initial communist revolution, in a multi-nation capitalist controlled country and/or state and/or union, a communist party can be either single- or multi-nation and still support single-nation countries. Secession can be supported as a strategy as well.

And with the knowledge of the correct nation definition, where the same nations exist in multiple countries and continents, communist sympathizers should use their imperialist, high-income savings to leave their unrevolutionary, imperialist, labor-aristocratic, capitalist countries and go wage revolution in imperialized capitalist countries where/if their nation is proletarianized and is either in charge of the country or able to secede. There's no expectation for communist sympathizers to go to a foreign nation and transform themselves into that nationality (although those who don't care about their own (actual) nation should leave regardless to join a communist-armed revolution anywhere since they're not helping communism or anti-imperialism in any meaningful way by staying anyway), but they should only remain if these conditions aren't met.

Otherwise they should either try to bypass their labor aristocracy by starting a communist party engaged in armed revolution without a proletariat or accept the communist sympathizer title, promote anti-imperialist policies (guaranteeing food globally, equal exchange trade, etc.), and donate (return) part of their money to high-impact charities that serve imperialized capitalist countries. Donating to charities is non-revisionist, capitalist-reformist, mutual aid, but it's a realistic, legal, and fine option for communist sympathizers to perform since they're not going to be communists anyway; it's better than them living as selfish labor aristocrats.



Nation examples:

European-English (European white-English) nation = U.S./Canada/UK/Australia/New Zealand:

- In the long term, host nation status in the current violent established formerly violent settler capitalist countries is uncertain, because while the actual host nations aren't currently large enough to fill all the imperialist “developed” lands, eventually they could grow large enough, in which case remigration back to England and national language reverse transformation and remigration back to Europe could occur if permission for host nation status isn't granted. In the short term, short-term host nation status is certain, because the host nations aren't currently large enough to fill all the imperialist “developed” lands, and potentially temporary single-nation countries can be created in the meantime to set a path for progress.
- Ireland/Scotland/Wales need to reverse transform by predominantly speaking their own languages again if they want to be independent or accept the European-English nationality and rename their countries to England.
- European-English nation in South Africa needs to remigrate, because it doesn't make sense to start a small country there when there's room in other countries.
- Post-secession in their respective continents, these countries need to be one connected country on separate continents named England.

Sub-Saharan African-English (Sub-Saharan African black-English) nation = U.S./Trinidad/Guyana/Cameroon/etc.:

- In the long term, host nation status in the non-violent formerly violently enslaved settler U.S. is uncertain, because while the actual host nations aren't currently large enough to fill all the imperialist “developed” lands, eventually they could grow large enough, in which case remigration back to Africa or to other Sub-Saharan African-English countries could occur if permission for host nation status isn't granted. In the short term, short-term host nation status is certain, because the host nations aren't currently large enough to fill all the imperialist “developed” lands, and a potentially temporary single-nation country can be created in the meantime to set a path for progress.
- South Asian Indian-English nation in Trinidad and Guyana will need to secede.
- Sub-Saharan African-English nation in England needs to remigrate, because it doesn't make sense to start a small country there when there's room in other countries.
- Due to past forced national language transformation, the Sub-Saharan African-English nation needs to decide if they want to reverse transform and speak their own language(s) or keep speaking English.
- Post-secession in their respective continents, these countries need to be one connected country on separate continents with the country name and language to be determined.